DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 091 EC 103 555

AUTHOR	Plummer, Bonnie Ann
TITLE	Integration of Preschool Severely Handicapped Children.
INSTITUTION	Solano County School System, Fairfield, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Jul 77
CONTRACT	76-33-C
NOTE	68p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Patterns; Exceptional Child Research; Observation; *Parent Attitudes; *Peer Relationship; Play; Preschool Education; Program Effectiveness; *Regular Class Placement; *Severely Handicapped; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study involving 16 preschool students was conducted to determine whether severely handicapped preschool children could learn normal classroom behavior through the single treatment variable of exposure to the regular classroom environment with normal peers. Systematic observation of the children's free play and verbal interaction, independence in groups, direction following, and incidences of bizarre behavior were recorded at five intervals throughout the year. Teacher and parent attitudes were also assessed. Among findings were that there was a trend in free play interaction situations away from unoccupied behavior and toward playing with other children, there were significant increases in the verbal interactions in response to questions, and attitudes of both teachers and parents were positive. (Attachments, which make up the bulk of the document, include an outline of the 10 variables measured, sample observation record sheets, sample teacher and parent questionnaires, and teacher and parent comments regarding the program.) (Author/SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED148091

INTEGRATION OF PRESCHOOL SEVERELY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Bonnie Ann Plummer
Project Director

Prepared Under Grant No. 76-33-C Between the California State Department of Education and the Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools.

Project Development and
Management Unit

Office of the Solano County
Superintendent of Schools

July 29, 1977

EJ103555

FOREWARD

Statement of funding:

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education in the Project Development and Management Unit, Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools.

The study was carried out during the academic year 1976-77 under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Grant No. 76-33-C between the State Department of Education and the Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools.

Disclaimer:

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant, and in order to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools is not implied.

ABSTRACT

During the 1976-77 school year, the Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools conducted a study to determine whether severely handicapped preschool children could learn normal classroom behavior through the single treatment variable of exposure to the regular classroom environment with normal peers. A total of sixteen (16) students in five (5) preschools participated in the program. Systematic observations of the children's free play and verbal interactions, independence in groups, direction following, and incidences of bizarre behavior were recorded at five (5) intervals throughout the year in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Teacher and parent attitudes were also assessed.

Three (3) of the ten (10) variable subscales upon which the children were observed showed statistically significant improvement. There was a definite trend in free play interaction situations away from unoccupied behavior and toward playing with other children. There was a significant change toward fewer nonresponses to teacher directions which indicated that the children improved in their understanding and responding to adults. There were also significant increases in the verbal interactions in response to questions. While maturation is a possible intervening variable, the composition of the subject made a control group unrealistic.

Attitudes of both teachers and parents were quite positive. The majority felt the program was worthwhile and that both the regular preschool children and the handicapped children had benefitted from the experience.

Three recommendations are posited. In view of the gains of the children and the perceptions of the teachers and parents, the program should be continued and expanded. Finally, emphasis of current legislation on integration at the preschool level would be advised.

Future areas of research included were the differential effects of integration on sex, structured vs. nonstructured preschool programs, and type or degree of disabilities (physical vs. mental).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Tables and/or Illustrations	1
Historical Overview and Literature Review	2
Methods	3
Statistical Approach/Analysis	6
Data Presentation	7
Results	11
Summary/Conclusion/Recommendations	16
Bibliography	19
Attachment #1	20
Attachment #2	26
Attachment #3	37
Attachment #4	38
Attachment #5	40
Attachment #6	49
Attachment #7	53
Attachment #8	59

TABLES

TABLE	TITLE
1	Level of Social Participation
2	Types of Activities
3	Choice of Playmates
4	Independence in Group Activity
5	Adherence
6	Resistance
7	Non-Response
8	Bizarre Behavior
9	Verbal Interactions
10	Verbal Interactions Initiation
11	Summary of X^2 Values Obtained on Ten Observation Scales at Periods 1 & 5
12	Changes in Individual Pupil Scores
13	Changes in Verbal Interaction: Responses

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Recently mainstreaming (Birch, 1974) and normalization (Wolfensberger, 1972) have become familiar terms in special education. The integration of handicapped children into regular school classes has become an established program concept nationally and throughout California elementary and secondary school grades (Reger, 1974). At the preschool level, the integration of handicapped children is not yet widely practiced with few exceptions including those efforts mandated by Head Start (Wylle, 1976). Furthermore, at both the preschool and the regular school situations, the means of measuring the impact of integration upon handicapped children and upon the normal children are not well developed.

The Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools under a Special Education Research grant, conducted a study to determine whether severely handicapped preschool children could learn normal classroom behavior through the single treatment variable of exposure to the regular classroom environment with normal peers. Two facets of information supported this rationale. First, research studies indicated the positive behavioral influences realized as a result of modeling (Cullinan, 1975; Wylle, 1976; Stevenson, 1972). This imitation phenomenon occurred regardless of the presence of reinforcements and/or programming (Bandura and Jeffrey, 1973). In addition, a pilot study was conducted for 21 severely handicapped students for a period of five weeks in the summer of 1975 by the Irene Larsen Center in Vacaville. Survey forms distributed to special education teachers, preschool teachers, and the parents of the handicapped children following the integration experience indicated that 100% of those surveyed felt this was a positive experience for their children. Ninety-five percent felt the students could be successfully integrated, but all indicated that generalization of newly learned behaviors did not occur because of the limited scope of the program.

While the integration of preschool handicapped children has occurred in various locations (Klein, 1975; Lewis, 1973; Anastasiow, 1975; Wylle, 1976), to date there has not been established a quantitative procedure for measuring growth in the severely handicapped child as a result of integration. Behavior coding systems are available for late elementary age students in the mentally retarded category (Gottlieb, et. al.), but reports of growth for preschool handicapped children have been based on parent and teacher observations. Consequently, the reports did not objectively demonstrate the results of the integration program with particular emphasis upon the growth of normalized behavior in the severely handicapped child. This research study explored these issues.

METHODS

Subject

A total of twenty students with the following ages and handicaps participated in the integration program.

Handicap	Frequency	Mean Age	Age Range
Orthopedically handicapped	9	4.2 years	3-5 years
Down Syndrome	6	6.1 years	4-10 years
Developmentally disabled	2	4.3 years	4-5 years
Mentally Retarded	3	5.1 years	3-6 years

Procedure

The methods used to evaluate this program consisted of systematic observations of the handicapped children and a measure of the attitudes of their teachers and parents.

Development of the Observation Instrument

Five variables of interest were defined, including (1) free play interaction, (2) response to structured activities, (3) response to directions of adults, (4) bizarre behavior and (5) verbal interactions.

A search of the literature was made (1) to determine if an instrument existed that could be used or modified and (2) to better define the variables of interest. Two automated retrieval systems were used (SMERC and Council of Exceptional Children) and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests and Measurements was contacted. None of these resources yielded an observation instrument or helped materially to define the variables. However, three compendiums[1] of tests were located that collectively formed the basis for an adequate observation instrument. Scale definitions related to the five variables of interest were abstracted and modified and were

1 Johnson, O. G. & Bommarito, J. Tests & Measurements in Child Development: A Handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
Walker, D. K. Socioemotional Measures for Preschool & Kindergarten Children: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
Simon, A. & Boyer, G. Mirrors for Behavior. An Anthology of Classroom Behavior Instruments. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1967.

organized into ten subscales which varied from one to six points each, as follows:

Variable	Subscales	No. of Points
Free Play Interaction	Level of Social Participation	6
	Types of Activities	6
	Choice of Playmates	4
Response to Structured Activity	Independence in Group Activity	5
Response to Directions of Adults	Adherence	3
	Resistance	3
	Non-response	2
Bizarre Behavior	Bizarre Behavior	2
Verbal Interactions	Responses	4
	Initiation	4

Definition of the scale points for each of these can be found in Attachment #1. Project staff was asked to review the scale points and respond to four questions:

1. Are the types of scales suggested those which tap the variables of interest to you?

2. Are the observable behaviors listed mutually exclusive?

3. Are there additional observable behaviors that should be listed?

4. Are there additional concrete examples that can be added under each observable behavior listed?

An observation instrument was then developed, along with a procedure to train observers (aides) and determine inter-rater reliability. (See Attachment #2). Due to the introduction of a videotape into the training session, these procedures were modified as described below.

Training of Observers

The five aides received the definitions of the scale points one week prior to the training workshop and were instructed to read them thoroughly. The observation training workshop was held on October 15 for the five aides. A videotape was prepared for the training session in which two handicapped

children were taped for each environment condition. (The procedure outlined in Attachment #2 was utilized.) After each independent observation of the tape by the five observers, each of them discussed what behaviors they recorded and why. Definitions were clarified, but no significant problems arose.

The inter-rater reliability on the observations recorded by the five aides during this training workshop was .94.

Five observation periods were planned as follows:

Observation Period	Date Week of:
1	10/18/76
2	12/06/76
3	2/07/77
4	4/11/77
5	5/23/77

The aides observed the children for a seven-minute interval, recording four separate one-minute observations with three one-minute intervals between observations.

Development of Teacher and Parent Questionnaires

Pre and post questionnaires for teachers and parents were developed after consultation with the project director concerning the specific objectives of the program. The Clearinghouse for Locally Developed Survey Instruments[1] was used as a resource to select and/or adapt portions of the most relevant parent and teacher survey instruments used by other California schools to evaluate their programs. Draft instruments were reviewed by the project director and are included as Attachments #3 through #8.

1 Unpublished resource developed by the California Evaluation Improvement Project, California State Department of Education, 1977.

STATISTICAL APPROACH/ANALYSIS

Sixteen children had complete observation records at times 1, 3 and 5. The analysis that follows includes a χ^2 test of significance between Observation Periods 1 and 5 and an analysis of the growth patterns of individual children at Observation Periods 1, 3 and 5 on those variables which showed significant changes in the χ^2 analysis. Attitudinal data from parents and teachers have simply been tabulated and reported, together with examples of types of comments from parents of both the regular preschool children and the handicapped children and the teachers.

DATA PRESENTATION

Summary data upon which the χ^2 analysis of observations was made are presented in Tables 1 through 10*below:

Table 1

Level of Social Participation

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Unoccupied Behavior	6	1	7
B. Solitary Play	15	15	30
C. Onlooker Behavior	6	7	13
D. Parallel Play	19	4	23
E. Associative Play	13	28	41
F. Cooperative Play	6	9	15
Totals	65	64	129

Table 2

Types of Activities

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Dramatic Play	9	16	25
B. Table Activities	18	17	35
C. Creative Activities	14	9	23
D. Blocks & Toys	13	11	24
E. Books, Music, Records	4	7	11
F. Other	4	4	8
Totals	62	64	126

* All entries in Tables 1 through 10 are frequencies of occurrence of each of the specified scale points.

Table 3

Choice of Playmates

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Other Handicapped	5	1	6
B. Non-handicapped	26	30	56
C. Both	7	16	23
D. Neither	23	17	40
Totals	61	64	125

Table 4

Independence in Group Activity

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Functions One-to-One	20	17	37
B. Functions/Small Group	16	27	43
C. Needs Directions	8	11	19
D. Group Activities	4	4	8
E. Independently	6	5	11
Totals	54	64	118

Table 5

Adherence

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Responds Promptly	19	23	42
B. Responds After Brief Hesitation	15	9	24
C. Responds After Urging	6	10	16
Totals	40	42	82

Table 6

Resistance

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Overt Delay	5	1	6
B. Verbal Resistance	3	8	11
C. Physical Resistance	3	2	5
Totals	11	11	22

Table 7

Non-Response

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Does Not Understand	18	6	24

Table 8

Bizarre Behavior

Scale	Observation Period		Total
	1	5	
A. Rock Back & Forth	4	3	7
B. Pull, Twist Hair	-0-	-0-	-0-
C. Make Sounds to Self	4	4	8
D. Rub Eyes	1	-0-	1
E. Play with Own Body	9	6	15
F. Wave Arms	1	-0-	1
G. Play with Items on Desk	1	2	3
Totals	20	15	35

Table 9

Verbal Interactions
Responses

Scale	Observation Period 1	Observation Period 5	Total
1. Shakes or Nods Head	9	1	10
2. Makes Non-word Noises	12	18	30
3. Utters Single Word Responses	2	12	14
4. Responds Intelligibly	4	17	21
Totals	27	48	75

Table 10

Verbal Interactions

Initiation

Scale	Observation Period 1	Observation Period 5	Total
1. Gestures Only	5	6	11
2. Non-Intelligible Noise	11	15	26
3. Single Word Utterance	2	10	12
4. Verbal Request	6	17	23
Totals	24	48	72

Additional tables are presented in the Results section as appropriate for the analysis. Summary data for the teacher and parent questionnaires are presented in Attachments #3 through #8 because they are so voluminous and because the poor response rate of the parent post-questionnaire makes its utility marginal.

RESULTS

Results are presented in three sections; (1) observations of the children, (2) teacher attitudes and (3) parent attitudes.

Observations of the Children

Table 11, below, summarizes the results of the X^2 analysis.

Table 11

Summary of X^2 Values Obtained on Ten Observation Scales at Periods 1 & 5

Scale	df.	X^2
Level of Participation	5	19.51*
Types of Activities	5	4.03
Choice of Playmates	3	7.29
Independence in Group Activity	4	2.81
Adherence	2	2.83
Resistance	2	5.14
Non-Response	1	6.0 **
Bizarre Behavior	6	2.39
Verbal Interactions: Responses	3	18.35*
Verbal Interactions: Initiation	3	3.70

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level

As may be readily seen, significant changes were noted in three areas- Level of Social Participation, Non-Response and Verbal Interactions (Responses).

There was a definite trend among the handicapped children to engage in higher levels of social participation. In particular, there were proportionately more incidences of associative play and less unoccupied behavior and parallel play noted during Observation Period 5 than during Observation Period 1.

This analysis applies to the group and it cannot be assumed that every

child in the group progressed equally. Therefore, individual profiles of each child were plotted and are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Changes in Individual Pupil Scores on Level of Social Participation[1]

	Observation Period				
				Change	
Pupil	1	3	5	1 To 3	1 To 5
1	5.0	1.5	5.0	-3.5	-0-
2	1.75	2.75	2.5	+1.0	+ .75
3	2.0	1.75	3.5	- .25	+1.5
4	2.5	3.0	5.0	+ .5	+2.5
5	4.75	5.75	5.75	+1.0	+1.0
6	3.5	2.75	2.5	- .75	-1.0
7	4.25	3.0	5.5	-1.25	+1.25
8	4.0	4.0	4.75	-0-	+ .75
9	1.25	1.0	1.75	- .25	+ .5
10	4.5	4.0	5.0	- .5	+ .5
11	4.25	3.75	4.25	- .5	-0-
12	3.0	3.25	2.0	+ .25	-1.0
13	6.0	1.5	5.0	-4.5	-1.0
14	3.0	3.25	4.75	+ .25	+1.75
15	3.5	3.75	2.25	+ .25	-1.25
16	3.25	4.25	6.0	+1.0	+2.75

As will be noted from Table 12, growth patterns of individual children were very erratic and there seemed to be a general tendency for Level of Social Participation to drop during Observation Period 3. However, ten of the sixteen youngsters showed some improvement at Observation Period 5 over their initial status at Observation Period 1.

---

1 To obtain individual pupil scores, scale points were assigned the following values:

1 = Unoccupied Behavior
2 = Solitary Play
3 = Onlooker Behavior
4 = Parallel Play
5 = Associative Play
6 = Cooperative Play

Entries in Table 12 are mean values based on these scale points.

There seemed to be a significant reduction in the tendency for the children not to respond to the directions of adults in the variable, Non-Response.

The third variable which showed a statistically significant gain was Verbal Interactions: Responses. There was a definite trend away from shaking or nodding responses toward uttering single word responses or intelligible phrases.

Once again, individual pupil profiles were examined and are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Changes in Verbal Interaction: Responses*

Pupil	Observation Period			Change	
	1	3	5	1 To 3	1 To 5
1	-0-	-0-	4.0	-0-	+ 4.0
2	2.0	2.25	1.75	+ .25	- .25
3	-0-	-0-	2.0	-0-	+ 2.0
4	-0-	3.25	4.0	+ 3.25	+ 4.0
5	1.0	2.25	2.0	+ 1.25	+ 1.0
6	1.67	2.75	2.0	+ 1.08	+ .33
7	-0-	1.75	2.0	+ 1.75	+ 2.0
8	4.0	4.0	4.0	-0-	-0-
9	-0-	2.0	2.0	+ 2.0	+ 2.0
10	1.0	2.75	3.0	+ 1.75	+ 2.0
11	4.0	4.0	4.0	-0-	-0-
12	2.25	3.0	3.0	+ .75	+ .75
13	-0-	4.0	4.0	+ 4.0	+ 4.0
14	1.75	2.0	2.5	+ .25	+ .75
15	1.5	2.0	2.0	+ .5	+ .5
16	-0-	1.5	3.0	+ 1.5	+ 3.0

As may be readily seen from Table 13, twelve children showed improvement between Observation Periods 1 and 3. Thirteen did so between Observation Periods 1 and 5.

---

* To obtain individual pupil scores, scale points were assigned the following values:

1 = shakes or nods head; 2 = babbles, grunts, or makes some non-word responses; 3 = utters single word responses to outside stimulus; 4 = gives responses in intelligble phrases. Entries in Table 13 are mean values based on these scale points.

Teacher Attitudes

All seven preschool teachers in the program responded to both pre and post questionnaires designed to assess their attitudes toward the integration of handicapped children in the preschool situation. Their attitudes were very positive in terms of worths and benefits of the program and several made comments in this respect on the post-questionnaire. One such comment was:

> "Every handicapped child in our class gained a great deal of independence and self assurance. It was worthwhile for all the children. The regular children became more aware of other people around them and learned tactfulness. The handicapped children became so enthusiastic in their play and relationships. Some of this was vicarious, but it was a blossoming that was beautiful to see and not to be discounted."

Further comments and a tabulation of teacher responses can be found in Attachments #3 and #4.

Parent Attitudes

Pre and post questionnaires were sent to parents of both handicapped and regular preschool children. The pre-questionnaire response rate was moderately high, with 55 of the 69 (80%) parents of the regular preschool children responding and 15 of the 20 (75%) parents of handicapped children responding.

The post-questionnaire response rate was poor, with only 29 of the 55 (53%) regular preschool children's parents responding and ten of the 15 (67%) parents of handicapped children responding. Two factors influenced the low rate of return. First, there is a high mobility rate in this area, and, second, many children did not continue in the preschool program throughout the three sessions during the year.

The overwhelming majority of parents felt they understood the goals of the program and that it was very worthwhile. Most felt their child had benefited from the program and that it was not detrimental to their child. Communication between home and school was also rated highly.

Further positive attitudes were reflected by such comments as these:

> "I feel it is very worthwhile; that all children can benefit from this experience. Just because a child is handicapped, doesn't mean he/she should be isolated from normal kids."

> "I would like to state that Bethany Lutheran Preschool in my mind, receives pluses. The atmosphere in the classroom is one of happiness and love. The children

all seem to enjoy the experience of school and are very happy to see each other. The teachers and their helpers really make an effort and it shows in the children. I feel the integration program is a worthwhile program and I hope it continues as it benefits all."

At post-questionnaire time, several additional questions were posed to the parents of the handicapped children. These questions dealt with the parent's perception of the progress made by their child and their willingness to contribute time or money if the program were to continue another year. (Specifically, see Attachment #8, items #20-26.) Four of the ten (40%) parents felt their child had benefitted enough from the program to continue another year and would be willing to contribute to the support of the program by paying a tuition fee. Only three of the ten (30%) parents felt they would be able to contribute any of their time to aid in the program.

In addition, the general attitudes of all parents were assessed, using a modification of the Kropp-Verner Scale.[1] Items are arranged in order from most favorable to least favorable and parents were asked to check all that accurately reflected their personal reaction to the program.

The general attitude of the parents, again, was quite favorable. The average (median) parent felt the program had "helped their child personally." Twenty of the 39 (51%) parents who responded claimed, "It was one of the most rewarding experiences he/she has ever had," while there were only two checks on the negative side. Eight of the ten (80%) parents of the handicapped children "hoped their child could continue next year."

A tabulation of the parent responses to the objective questions and the attitude scale and their comments can be found in Attachments #5 through #8.

1 Kropp, R. P. & Verner, C. An attitude scale technique for evaluating meetings. Adult Education, VII (4) Summer, 1957.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

During the 1976-77 school year, the Office of the Solano County Superintendent of Schools conducted a study to determine whether severely handicapped preschool children could learn normal classroom behavior through the single treatment variable of exposure to the regular classroom with normal peers and to establish a quantitative procedure for measuring growth in these children as a result of integration.

Two facets of information provided the impetus for the current study. First, several research studies have indicated positive behavioral changes as a result of modeling (Cullinan, 1975; Wylle, 1976; Stevenson, 1972). Second, improvement in behavior as a result of modeling can occur regardless of reinforcements and programming (Bandura and Jeffries, 1973). Although the integration of preschool handicapped children has occurred in various locations (Klein, 1975; Wylle, 1976), these studies have not utilized a quantitative procedure for reflecting the type and degree of behavioral improvement.

In the present investigation, sixteen preschool handicapped pupils with severe physical or mental disabilities were integrated into five preschools with no other treatment intervention except the addition of five instructional aides, one for each school, to provide transportation to and from the preschool class and to provide help for the preschool teacher.

Since automated searches of SMERC, ERIC, and CEC indicated that no suitable instruments were available to objectively evaluate the effects of integration upon the social interaction of severely handicapped preschool children on five variables of interest. These variables included:

1. Free play interaction
2. Response to structured activities
3. Response to directions of adults
4. Bizarre behavior
5. Verbal interactions

Three compendiums (Johnson S. Bommarito, 1971; Walker, 1973; and Simon & Boyer, 1967) and a survey of project staff helped to delimit the five main behaviors. These behavioral classes were further specified to ten behavioral subscales. Each subscale consisted of between one to six discrete behaviors and are listed below:

Variable	Subscale
Free Play Interaction	Level of Social Participation
	Types of Activities
	Choice of Playmates
Response to Structured Activities	Independence in Group Activity

Variable	Subscale
Response to Directions of Adults	Adherence Resistance Non-Response
Bizarre Behavior	Bizarre Behavior
Verbal Interactions	Responses Initiation

Obtained inter-rater reliability for the observation instrument was found to be high ($r = .94$).

Three of the ten behavioral subscales showed significant improvement between the first observation period in October and the last observation period at the end of May. They were: Level of Participation ($p<.05$); Non-Response ($p<.01$) and Verbal Interactions: Responses ($p<.05$).

These results indicated that in free play interaction situations, the handicapped children as a group, increased their play time with other children and decreased unoccupied behavior. A significant decrease in non-response to adult directions implicates an improved understanding and responsiveness to adults over the course of the school year. There was also evidence of increased verbal interactions in response to questions. Since no control group was employed in this study, it is not appropriate to conclude that the treatment effect is responsible for these positive findings apart from maturation alone.

Finally, as a part of the effort to evaluate the preschool integration program, questionnaires were sent to the preschool teachers and parents of the handicapped and the non-handicapped preschool children. One hundred per cent of the teachers and ninety-seven per cent of all parents felt the program was worthwhile. One hundred per cent of the teachers and ninety-two per cent of the parents felt both the handicapped and non-handicapped children had benefitted from the experience. Teacher and parent attitudes were initially positive and remained positive after the school year program was finished.

Two recommendations based upon the results of this study were given. In view of the progress of the children on the three (operationally defined and systematically observed) behavioral subscales, and the favorable opinions expressed by the teachers and parents, the preschool integration program should be continued and perhaps expanded in both time frame and population. In addition, current legislative emphasis on integration has occurred at the upper elementary grades (Gickling and Theobald, 1975). The findings of this study would indicate that integration experiences at an earlier age would be advantageous. These experiences would provide an essential developmental learning environment and enable the severely handicapped child to learn appropriate and desired behaviors through modeling.

Further research in the area of integration of severely mentally and physically handicapped preschool children is necessary in order to clarify

conclusions found in this investigation. Aspects such as sex differences, structured vs. unstructured preschool programs, and type of disabilities (physical vs. mental) and their effects on integration should be considered in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandura, A., & R. W. Jeffery, Role of Symbolic Coding and Rehearsal Processes in Observational Learning; Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 122-130.

Birch, J. W., Retarded Pupils in the Mainstream: The Special Education of Educable Mentally Retarded Pupils in Regular Classes; Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Cullinan, D., Modeling: Research with Implications for Special Education; Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9 (2), 209-221.

Gottlieb, J., D. H. Gampel & M. Budoff, Classroom Behavior of Retarded Children Before and After Integration into Regular Classes; Journal of Special Education, 1975, 9 (3), 307-315.

Johnson, O. G. & J. Bommarito, Tests & Measurements in Child Development: A Handbook; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Klein, J. W., Mainstreaming the Preschooler; Young Children, 1975, 317-326.

Reger, R., What Does Mainstreaming Mean?; Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1974, 7 (8), 513-515.

Simon, A. & G. Boyer, Mirrors for Behavior: An Anthology of Classroom Behavior Instruments: Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1967.

Stevenson, H., Children's Learning: New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

Walker, D. K., Socioemotional Measures for Preschool & Kindergarten Children: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Wolfensberger, W., Normalization; Toronto: National Institute of Mental Retardation, 1972.

Wylle, R. E., Integrating Handicapped and Nonhandicapped Preschool Children: Effects on Social Play; Childhood Education, 1974, 50 (6), 360-364.

Variable

Free Play Interaction

Scales

Level of Social Participation (6 points)
Types of Activities (6 points)
Choice of Playmate (4 points)

Observable Behaviors

1. Level of Social Participation

   a. Unoccupied Behavior
   The child apparently is not playing at all, at least not in the usual sense, but occupies himself with watching anything which happens to be of momentary interest. When there is nothing exciting taking place, he plays with his own body, gets on and off chairs, just stands around, follows the teacher, or sits in one spot glancing around the room.

   b. Solitary Play
   The child plays alone and independently with toys that are different from those used by the children within speaking distance and makes no effort to get close to or speak to the other children. His interest is centered upon his own activity, and he pursues it without reference to what others are doing.

   c. Onlooker Behavior
   The child spends most of his time watching the others play. He often talks to the playing children, asks questions, or gives suggestions, but does not enter into the play himself. He stands or sits within speaking distance of the group so he can see and hear all that is taking place. Thus, he differs from the unoccupied child, who notices anything that happens to be exciting and is not especially interested in groups of children.

   d. Parallel Play
   The child plays independently, but the activity he chooses naturally brings him among other children. He plays with toys which are like those which the children around him are using, but he plays with toys as he sees fit, without trying to influence the activity of the children near him. Thus, he plays beside, rather than with, other children. This activity is characterized by physical proximity and similarity of activity with reference to other children.

   e. Associative Play
   The child plays with other children. They may be borrowing and lending play materials or following one another with trains and wagons. There are mild attempts to control which children may or may not play in the group. All are engaged in similar, if not

identical, activity. There is no division of labor and no organization of activity. Each child acts as he wishes and does not subordinate his interest to the group. There is interaction between children, but no common goal.

f. Cooperative Play
The child plays within a group that is organized for the purpose of making some material product, of striving to attain some competitive goal, of dramatizing situations of adult or group life, or of playing formal games. There is a marked sense of belonging or not belonging to the group. The control of the group situation is in the hands of one or two members who direct the activity of others. The goal and the method of obtaining it necessitates a division of labor, the taking of different roles by various group members, and the organization of activity so that the efforts of one child are supplemented by those of another. The critical distinction is the goal-directedness of the group.

2. Types of Activities
   a. Dramatic play (housekeeping, dress-up, etc.)
   b. Table activities (puzzles, games, tile sets)
   c. Creative activities (painting, collage, pasting, clay)
   d. Blocks and toys (equipment usually played with on the floor)
   e. Books, music, records
   f. Other

3. Choice of Playmate(s)
   a. Other handicapped
   b. Non-handicapped
   c. Both
   d. Neither

Variable

Response to Structured Activities

Scale

Independence in Group Activity (5 points)

Observable Behaviors

1. Functions only in a one-to-one relationship with teacher or, occasionally, as one of two children with a teacher/adult doing an activity.

2. Functions in a small group (5 or less) with continuous support of teacher/adult.

3. Needs clear directions and/or materials assembled, but can carry out activity in group.

4. Functions in group activities; can carry through two or three different activities as long as instructions and expectations are clear. Occasional feedback from teacher/adult may be necessary.

5. Functions independently once group activities have been structured.

Variable

Response of Children to Directions of Adult in Classroom

Scales

Adherence (3 points)
Resistance (3 points)

Observable Behaviors

1. Adherence
   a. Responds appropriately to directions (without hesitation or resistance).
   b. Responds appropriately after brief hesitation (without urging).
   c. Responds appropriately after urging or reminding (offers nc overt resistance).

2. Resistance
   a. Overt delay (ignores teacher, continues with another activity, says, "In a minute").
   b. Verbal resistance (says, "No, I won't.").
   c. Physical resistance (pulls away, runs out of a classroom).

3. Non-Response
   a. Does not appear to understand or associate (stares blankly, looks around to others for cues, looks confused).

Questions

1. Do you want to try to discriminate between whether directions are given to individual child or to the group in general?

2. Do you want to try to discriminate among complexity of directions? (Simple - "Come here. Sit down"; with cues-verbal plus gestures; two or more directions given at one time - "Go over there and get the crayon and then draw a ball")?

Variable

Bizarre Behavior

Scale

Bizarre Behavior: Presence or Absence (2 points)

Observable Behaviors

1. Rocking back and forth (sitting or standing)

2. Pulling or twisting hair.

3. Talking, mumbling, singing, whistling to self.

4. Continually rubbing eyes.

5. Fidgeting or playing with face or other parts of own body.

6. Waving arms.

7. Playing with items on desk.

Comments

Differentiated from other behaviors in that it is due to internal rather than external stimuli.

Variable

Verbal Interactions

Scales

Responses (4 points)
Initiation (4 points)

Observable Behaviors

1. Responses

   a. Shakes or nods head in response to questions; approaches another person in response to a request; points to self when asked, "Who wants it?" (bodily response).

   b. Babbles, grunts or makes some non-word noise (incomprehensible vocalization).

   c. Utters single word responses to outside stimulus.

   d. Gives responses in intelligible phrases.

2. Initiation

These categories are parallel to those listed under responses, but are recorded when the child initiates verbal interaction.

Integration of Preschool
Severely Handicapped Children

Pre-Assessment of Inter-Rater Reliability
of Observation Instrument[1]

Directions:

1. Aides must read and become very thoroughly familiar with the categories that are to be coded.

2. Have one demonstration teacher plan a sequence of activities that will take into account each of the environmental conditions for which the observation instrument is planned (i.e., free play, structured activity, directions of adult).

3. Set a time when all aides can be present to observe the specially planned sequence.

4. Select one (1) handicapped child which all aides will observe at the same time.

5. As each new activity begins, allow two to three minutes for "warm-up". Then, each aide is to observe the responses of the selected handicapped child at the exact same time for a period of one (1) minute.

6. Select a second handicapped child and repeat the process.

7. For each environmental condition, repeat the process.

1 These are the original procedures which were subsequently modified to accomodate a videotape of two handicapped children.

Environmental Situation: Free Play Interaction

Name of Child _____ Date _____

Name of Observer _____

Directions: During a given observation period, plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by one-minute intervals. Record only the predominant behavior during any one observation period. Place one check mark (✓) in each column, for Sections I, II, & III.

I. Level of Social Participation

	Observation Periods					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Unoccupied Behavior						
B. Solitary Play						
C. Onlooker Behavior						
D. Parallel Play						
E. Associative Play						
F. Cooperative Play						

II. Types of Activities

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Dramatic Play (housekeeping, dress-up, etc.)						
B. Table Activities (puzzles, games, tile sets, etc.)						
C. Creative Activities (painting, collage, pasting, etc.)						
D. Blocks & toys (equipment usually played with on floor)						
E. Books, music, records						
F. Other						

III. Choice of Playmate(s)

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Other Handicapped						
B. Non-handicapped						
C. Both						
D. Neither						

Environmental Situation: Structured Activities (including Response to Directions of Adults)

Name of Child _____ Date _____

Name of Observer _____

Directions: During a given observation period, plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by one-minute intervals. Record only the predominant behavior during any one observation period. Place only one (1) check mark (✓) in each column under Sections I, II, III & IV.

I. Independence in Group Activity

A. Functions only in a one-to-one relationship with teacher or, occasionally, as one of two children with a teacher/adult doing an activity.

B. Functions in a small group (5 or less) with continuous support of teacher/adult.

C. Needs clear directions and/or materials assembled, but can carry out activity in group.

D. Functions in group activities; can carry through two or three different activities as long as instructions and expectations are clear. Occasional feedback from teacher/adult may be necessary.

E. Functions independently once group activities have been structured.

Observation Periods					
1	2	3	4	5	Total

II. Adherence

A. Responds appropriately to directions (without hesitation or resistance).

B. Responds appropriately after brief hesitation (without urging).

C. Responds appropriately after urging or reminding (offers no overt resistance).

1	2	3	4	5	Total

III. Resistance

A. Overt delay (ignores teacher, continues with another activity, says, "In a minute").

B. Verbal resistance (says "No, I won't").

C. Physical resistance (pulls away, runs out of classroom).

Observation Periods

1	2	3	4	5	Total

IV. Non-Response

A. Does not appear to understand or associate (stares blankly, looks around to others for cues, looks confused).

1	2	3	4	5	Total

Environmental Situation: Undefined (Spontaneous Behaviors)

Name of Child_____ Date_____

Name of Observer_____

Directions: These behaviors can occur at any time. Select an observation period when no other observations are being made. Plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by one-minute intervals. Record each behavior that occurs during each one-minute period. (There may be multiple checks in each column.)

	Observation Periods					
I. Bizzare Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Rocking back and forth (sitting or standing).						
B. Pulling or twisting hair.						
C. Talking, mumbling, singing, whistling to self.						
D. Continually rubbing eyes.						
E. Fidgeting or playing with face or other parts of own body.						
F. Waving arms.						
G. Playing with items on desk.						

II. Verbal Interactions	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Responses						
1. Shakes or nods head in response to questions; approaches another person in response to a request; points to self when asked "Who wants it?" (bodily response).						
2. Babbles, grunts or makes some non-word noise (incomprehensible vocalization).						
3. Utters single word responses to outside stimulus.						
4. Gives responses in intelligible phrases.						

B. Initiation

	Observation Periods					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1. Approaches another person to initiate interaction, but uses gestures only (no vocalization).						
2. Approaches another person using non-intelligible vocalization (babbles, grunts, etc.).						
3. Approaches another person with single word utterances.						
4. Approaches another person with a verbal request (more than one word intelligible phrases).						

Environmental Situation: Free Play Interaction

Name of Child _____ Date _____

Name of Observer _____

Directions: During a given observation period, plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by two-minute intervals. Record only the predominant behavior during any one observation period. Place one check mark (✓) in each column, for Sections I, II, & III.

Observation Periods

I. Level of Social Participation	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Unoccupied Behavior						
B. Solitary Play						
C. Onlooker Behavior						
D. Parallel Play						
E. Associative Play						
F. Cooperative Play						

II. Types of Activities	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Dramatic Play (housekeeping, dress-up, etc.)						
B. Table Activities (puzzles, games, tile sets, etc.).						
C. Creative Activities (painting, collage, pasting, etc.).						
D. Blocks & toys (equipment usually played with on floor).						
E. Books, music, records						
F. Other						

III. Choice of Playmate(s)	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A. Other Handicapped						
B. Non-handicapped						
C. Both						
D. Neither						

Environmental Situation: Undefined (Spontaneous Behaviors)

Name of Child_____ Date_____

Name of Observer_____

Directions: These behaviors can occur at any time. Select an observation period when no other observations are being made. Plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by two-minute intervals. Record each behavior that occurs during each one-minute period. (There may be multiple checks in each column.)

I. Bizarre Behavior

- A. Rocking back and forth (sitting or standing).
- B. Pulling or twisting hair.
- C. Talking, mumbling, singing, whistling to self.
- D. Continually rubbing eyes.
- E. Fidgeting or playing with face or other parts of own body.
- F. Waving arms.
- G. Playing with items on desk.

Observation Periods					
1	2	3	4	5	Total

II. Verbal Interactions

- A. Responses
  1. Shakes or nods head in response to questions; approaches another person in response to a request; points to self when asked, "Who wants it?" (bodily response).
  2. Babbles, grunts or makes some non-word noise (incomprehensible vocalization).
  3. Utters single word responses to outside stimulus.
  4. Gives responses in intelligible phrases.

1	2	3	4	5	Total

B. Initiation

	Observation Periods					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1. Approaches another person to initiate interaction, but uses gestures only (no vocalization).						
2. Approaches another person using non-intelligible vocalization (babbles, grunts, etc.).						
3. Approaches another person with single word utterances.						
4. Approaches another person with a verbal request (more than one word intelligible phrases).						

Environmental Situation: Structured Activities (including Response to Directions of Adults)

Name of Child _____ Date _____

Name of Observer _____

Directions: During a given observation period, plan 4 to 5 one-minute observations, separated by two-minute intervals. Record only the predominant behavior during any one observation period. Place only one (1) check mark (✓) in each column under Sections I, II, III & IV.

I. Independence in Group Activity

A. Functions only in a one-to-one relationship with teacher or, occasionally, as one of two children with a teacher/adult doing an activity.

B. Functions in a small group (5 or less) with continuous support of teacher/adult.

C. Needs clear directions and/or materials assembled, but can carry out activity in group.

D. Functions in group activities; can carry through two or three different activities as long as instructions and expectations are clear. Occasional feedback from teacher/adult may be necessary.

E. Functions independently once group activities have been structured.

1	2	3	4	5	Total

II. Adherence

A. Responds appropriately to directions (without hesitation or resistance).

B. Responds appropriately after brief hesitation (without urging).

C. Responds appropriately after urging or reminding (offers no overt resistance).

1	2	3	4	5	Total

III. Resistance

A. Overt delay (ignores teacher; continues with another activity, says, "In a minute").

B. Verbal resistance (says, "No, I won't").

C. Physical resistance (pulls away, runs out of classroom).

Observation Periods					
1	2	3	4	5	Total

IV. Non-Response

A. Does not appear to understand or associate (stares blankly, looks around to others for cues, looks confused).

1	2	3	4	5	Total

Teacher - PRE

Attachment #3

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	CHILDREN					
	REGULAR			SPECIAL ED.		
	YES	NO	NOT SURE	YES	NO	NOT SURE
1. An effort is being made to explain the program to the parents?	7			6		1
2. The program is worthwhile?	6		1	7		
3. The children will benefit from the program?	6		1	7		
4. The program will be detrimental to the children?		7			7	
5. This program will help the children to learn respect for each other?	6		1	5	1	1
6. The children seem to be happy in this class situation?	7			7		
7. The program will help the children to obtain a sense of self-worth?	7			7		
8. The program will be able to meet the individual needs of each child	5	1	1	5	1	1
9. The handicapped children will develop more independence in group activities?				7		
10. The program will help the handicapped children to communicate with others?				7		
11. The program will help the handicapped children to initiate communication with others?				6	(One answered "if possible")	

7 Distributed
7 Returned = 100%

Teacher - POST

Attachment #4

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	CHILDREN					
	REGULAR			SPECIAL ED.		
	YES	NO	NOT SURE	YES	NO	NOT SURE
1. An effort was made to explain the program to the parents?	7			4		3
2. The program was worthwhile?	7			7		
3. The children benefitted from the program?	7			7		
4. The program was detrimental to the children?		7			7	
5. This program helped the children to learn respect for each other?	6		1	4		3
6. The children were happy in this class situation?	7			7		
7. The program helped the children to obtain a sense of self-worth?	6		1	4		3
8. The program met the individual needs of each child in the class?	5		2	4	1	2
9. The handicapped children developed more independence in group activities?				6	1	
10. The program helped the handicapped children to communicate with others?				6		1
11. The program helped the handicapped children to initiate communication with others?				7		

7 Distributed
7 Returned = 100%

Post Comments: Teachers

"The regular preschool children learned to be tolerant and accept differences."

"The handicapped child couldn't talk, but she began to babble and walk up to the other children."

"I believe this program could have potential. During the year, the handicapped child made a small amount of progress. I was pleased to see the amount of acceptance the regular children put forth. This is important. The special education child did try to imitate the children at times. It does take a one-to-one ratio to be very successful with the special education child."

"The program had no adverse effect as children at this age are very acceptable to peers and surroundings. We saw the normal child reaching out to help and praise the handicapped children. I regret that the program did not get much individual attention from the county, as a questionnaire form as this could never take the place of seeing the interaction of the children. Also, I feel if the program is continued, that each school should be observed and evaluated so that the handicapped children will continue in the schools that can best serve their needs. Perhaps a suggestion would be to let parents pay the tuition as any other parent and the county pay for the required aid."

"I applaud the program fully. Three of the four handicapped children benefitted 1000%. I saw self worth, self respect and enthusiasm to interact grow abundantly in the handicapped children. The 'regular' students accepted the handicapped children as they would any child. There were no barriers. Two of the physically handicapped children made an apparent extra effort to overcome their handicap due to their enthusiasm to keep up with their non-handicapped peers. The teachers in the program made an effort to help the handicapped child as much or as little as they would a non-handicapped; hoping for a motivation in the handicapped child. Evidently, this was successful, as one child became more adept at handling his wheelchair, one made his inability to walk or run quickly unapparent, one found a way to reach his playmate five feet away, while another slightly overcame her attention-getting device of purposely falling or not walking in order to keep up with her obviously respected classmates. Discontinuation of this program would be detrimental to both handicapped and non-handicapped children."

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

CHILD'S NAME_____

How many years has your child been in a Special Education Class?_____

How many years has your child been in a regular preschool class?_____

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT...	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
1. An effort has been made to explain the program?	40	7	7	
2. You understand the goals of the program?	40	3	11	
3. This program is worthwhile?	48		6	
4. Your child will benefit from this program?	44		10	
5. The program will be detrimental to your child?	2	48	2	
6. Generally speaking, your child will be happy in this class situation?	51		3	
7. Your child likes school and is eager to attend?	54			
8. Your child feels secure both at home and at school?	54			
9. Your child is being treated fairly?	52		2	
10. The school is helping your child develop more self-confidence?	50	1	3	
11. Your child is receiving a program that meets his/her individual needs?	48	1	5	

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
12. Your child's teacher(s) is really interested in helping your child do well?	53			
13. Your child is encouraged to work to his/her potential?	44	2	7	
14. Your child is progressing at his/her own best rate?	45	1	7	
15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she is making?	52		1	
16. The school is making an effort to communicate with parents?	48	2	2	
17. The staff encourages the parents to visit the school?	50	1	3	
18. Your concerns are given proper attention?	46		4	
19. You would be interested in helping the children at school?	44	4	4	

20. Have you visited the preschool and observed the program? YES 40 NO 13

1 Omit

69 Distributed

55 Returned = 80%

Comments: Regular Preschool Parents

1. Do you feel that an effort has been made to explain the program?

I had no idea they were taking handicapped children.

Amy missed the first week of school so I wasn't told anything.

Not adequately.

A movie about the program was shown to parents before the school year began.

Only a brief mention of the program in the Tiny Tots brochure.

Did not know about it till I read your letter attached to these forms.

I don't feel the program was ever explained to the parents. I think this should be done.

Wasn't able to attend orientation.

No, but I agree with it completely.

At the very beginning.

I feel not enough parents have observed the program to give an analysis one way or the other.

Was mentioned at a parents meeting held before school began.

We were told that special children would be in the Tiny Tots.

2. Do you feel that you understand the goals of the program?

I feel it is for the benefit of both "normal" and special children.

Wasn't able to attend the orientation.

A good healthy learning environment for parent and child.

Would really like to learn more about it.

3. Do you feel this program is worthwhile?

I feel it is very worthwhile. That all children can benefit from this experience. Just because a child is handicapped doesn't mean he/she should be isolated from normal kids.

We really don't know.

I've discussed this type of program with others and feel it is beneficial.

Fantastic! Emily has really given of herself and is learning to help others and she loves it!

3. (continued)

Very.

We don't get any feedback on how children are doing.

Both of us are reaching goals with each other in this program.

4. Do you feel that your child will benefit from this program?

We really don't know.

Definitely.

Could benefit more if less than 28 were enrolled. Or if more qualified help was available.

I feel that any child deserves a fair chance in life to do as best he or she can.

She is very interested in the two handicapped children.

That is hard to judge at his age, but don't feel it can cause any harm.

Increased understanding of the handicapped.

I feel that all children need to live as normal a life as possible and going to school is a big part. I feel both my child and the handicapped child will beneift from being exposed to all aspects of life. The kids hardly even notice that some are different (handicapped).

Integration is good for both my child and the handicapped child.

5. Do you feel that the program will be detrimental to your child?

That depends upon whether any deceleration appears.

Just the opposite!

Only if I refuse to participate in school with her and shut her out.

I think it's a healthy idea.

6. Do you feel your child will be happy in this class situation?

There has been no change in her behavior as far as negative change is concerned.

She has been eager to go to class.

The kids seem to accept everyone without question.

The two handicapped children have progressed and integrated very well.

7. Do you feel your child likes school and is eager to attend?

Very much so.

The only problem is the kids in the regular preschool share a playground with Irene Larsen students and my kids refer to them as "rough" kids. The "special" students in their class are getting along fine.

School happens to be her only time with peers.

Most of the time he enjoys school.

8. Do you feel that your child feels secure both at home and at school?

Has certain jealousy at home with ten month old brother - some difficulty.

How do you know when a child "really" feels secure?

Most of the time.

9. Do you feel your child is being treated fairly?

So far.

I would guess so but I haven't yet observed the class.

10. Do you feel the school is helping your child to develop more self-confidence?

Hasn't attended this preschool long enough to really tell.

She has always been pretty self-confident.

Need more time to tell.

That is hard to judge after only a few months.

11. Do you feel your child is receiving a program that meets his/her individual needs?

I feel any child can develop at a better rate if given more individual consideration and attention. I realize the size of the classes prohibits this kind of attention. Perhaps parent-teacher meetings could be established to make both more aware of the child's progress at school and home. (This refers to #13 and 14 also.)

What they do at preschool has never really been detailed.

It's hard to guess just what her needs are or at least all of them.

Partly - he only attends two mornings a week.

12. Do you feel your child's teacher(s) is really interested in helping your child do well?

She encourages the children to do as much as they can and then will help them if they seem to need it.

We have very good teachers.

Feel teachers can't devote as much time as my child deserves or needs.

Janey Callahan is exceptionally kind to all the children.

I feel she is very interested.

Positively!

13. Do you feel your child is encouraged to work to his/her potential?

Shows an interest in reading - school encouragement?

No way of knowing.

My child is five years old. I feel the program is geared to the three and four year old children.

At this age (3), potential is hard to determine.

14. Do you feel your child is progressing at his/her own best rate?

Again, rate is not easy to determine at three years.

15. Do you feel your child is proud of the progress he/she is making?

Can't wait to show us what he made at school.

Very much so.

He is proud of the things he does at school.

16. Do you feel the school is making an effort to communicate with the parents?

They have conferences plus will discuss your child any time parents wish.

Monthly newsletters are sent home. Parents' nights are held monthly.

Definitely.

We're a parent co-op, so the parents are the school.

Parents participate.

Excellent.

Questionable.

16. (continued)

Fairfield Parent Preschool is a co-op run by the parents.

The school can't possibly survive without the parents working in class with kids.

It's a co-op preschool.

Little comment is made.

17. Do you feel the staff encourages the parents to visit school?

Nothing has been said, but I would like to visit.

But only when it is your turn to assist in class.

Really don't know too much about the policy of the school as yet.

Definitely.

The staff is the school.

Except that parents are required to give two days help.

Parents participate.

The parents of the two handicapped kids have visited our school several times.

Definitely!

18. Do you feel your concerns are given proper attention?

I do not have any concerns as I feel they have an excellent program.

The teacher as an individual seems receptive.

19. Do you feel you would be interested in helping the children at school?

I help when I can.

Occasionally.

Have a baby at home. I am unable to participate but would love to.

If needed.

When possible.

I would but I work during the day.

We work one day a week (or more) with the children.

Not sure what you mean in the way of helping.

19. (continued)

Except am expecting a baby at any moment so it is inconvenient at this time.

Haven't time - working.

Am not able to stay at school as I babysit, but would help in any other way possible.

We work once a week at the preschool.

All parents work different days at school involved in project with children.

I have a small child that is sick too often and transportation is hard for me.

Already work.

If asked, and I was able to make the time.

20. Have you visited the preschool and observed the program? Yes 40 No 13

I don't really feel that these questions pertain to Tiny Tots. The best thing that integration accomplishes is that the children can accept each other the way they are. They learn that some children are different and that's o.k.

Isolation feeds ignorance and ignorance feeds misunderstanding and fears. Please continue and expand your programs for the very young if possible. The younger they learn and understand each other, the better individual they become. If there is anything my husband or myself can do, please contact us and we will do what we can.

Come in and visit! It will feel good!

As secretary and board member of the Fairfield Parent Preschool, I'd like to emphasize that all of our members heartily support the integration of handicapped children into public schools. In fact, we can't understand why this hadn't been done years ago. We parents have learned and benefitted from our association with our two handicapped children. We would be sad to have them leave. It would be an injustice to segregate the handicapped children from society.

I would like to visit the school but we moved recently and it's been hard for us.

I would not have my child in a program I had not observed and felt he would receive proper, loving instruction in a free environment.

Only for a short time as Carolyn doesn't seem to be able to mix with the other children as long as "Mommy" is present.

Since Michelle and Levi started school last fall, my son doesn't know any difference between them and the other children. He knows Michelle can't talk but he can't understand some of the other kids. He also knows that

20. (continued)

Levi can't walk but his younger brother was born with bilateral clubfeet and has been in casts since he was nine days old, so he just thinks it's the same sort of corrective procedure. I think the integration program is very important at this age - especially in a parent co-op nursery school because the children will not grow up regarding handicapped children as "weirdos" or "freaks" and will be able to understand their problems better. Also, it helps the parents overcome their fears of working with them. I have found that my fear of being able to handle them correctly soon vanished because their handicap is <u>really</u> so slight. They're just kids, needing love and understanding and a little help from us "grown-ups." Thanks for the questionnaire - it let me tell you and others what a great idea this is.

I think the program is great! One of the special children is in my child's class. Emily sees nor feels that Dianna, the special child, is "different" from the other children. Emily helps Dianna play with toys and really enjoys it. I think if the special children are in the same classes with the other children at preschool, they don't feel repelled at the special children and don't feel they are "different."

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

CHILD'S NAME_____

How many years has your child been in a Special Education Class?_____

How many years has your child been in a regular preschool class?_____

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
1. An effort has been made to explain the program?	12		3	
2. You understand the goals of the program?	11	2	2	
3. This program is worthwhile?	14		1	
4. Your child will benefit from this program?	14		1	
5. The program will be detrimental to your child?		15		
6. Generally speaking, your child will be happy in this class situation?	15			
7. Your child likes school and is eager to attend?	15			
8. Your child feels secure both at home and at school?	14		1	
9. Your child is being treated fairly?	15			
10. The school is helping your child develop more self-confidence?	10		5	
11. Your child is receiving a program that meets his/her individual needs?	13	1	1	

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
12. Your child's teacher(s) is really interested in helping your child do well?	14		1	
13. Your child is encouraged to work to his/her potential?	11		4	
14. Your child is progressing at his/her own best rate?	12		2	
15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she is making?	12		1	
16. The school is making an effort to communicate with parents?	14			
17. The staff encourages the parents to visit the school?	14			
18. Your concerns are given proper attention?	13		1	
19. You would be interested in helping the children at school?	6	6	3	

20. Have you visited the preschool and observed the program? YES 5 NO 10

20 Distributed
15 Returned = 75%

55

Pre Comments: Handicapped Children's Parents

3. Do you feel this program is worthwhile?

Especially for my child.

I feel that any child deserves a fair chance in life to do as best he or she can.

4. Do you feel your child will benefit from this program?

It is her only exposure to normal children.

9. Do you feel your child is being treated fairly?

I feel that everyone at the preschool goes out of their way to accomodate my child.

10. Do you feel the school is helping your child develop more self-confidence?

Definitely.

I believe the program is important, but Aaron talks more of T.C. than the other school.

She enjoys being around other people, but I can't tell about self-confidence.

11. Do you feel your child is receiving a program that meets his/her potential?

I am not sure about Chris always being integrated with younger children. She is 5½.

Although I am glad John is in the program, the curriculum was designed for normal children to get them ready for kindergarten.

12. Do you feel your child's teacher(s) is really interested in helping your child do well?

I have never met her preschool teacher. Her regular teacher is interested.

I haven't spoken with the teacher only because I have never gone to the preschool. I'm sure the teacher is very good.

I am very pleased with my child's present teachers.

13. Do you feel your child is encouraged to work to his/her potential?

I believe Aaron is the only one that could answer this one and #14.

15. Do you feel your child is proud of the progress he/she is making?

Tanya does not talk,so hard to determine.

Pre Comments: Handicapped Children's Parents (continued)

16. Do you feel the school is making an effort to communicate with parents?

This letter is about all we've heard from the preschool program.

Much more since Terry ---- is there.

18. Do you feel your concerns are given proper attention?

I have never had to have any concerns yet.

19. Do you feel you would be interested in helping the children at school?

Due to health and other problems, I am not dependable.

I work.

Yes, volunteer if needed.

Have no transportation.

I do volunteer work at Irene Larsen.

Not at this time, no.

Need sitter for three year old.

I have a small child that is sick too often and transportation is hard for me.

20. Have you visited the preschool and observed the program? Yes 5 No 10

I might answer these questions differently in a couple of months. John is just settling in and also I have only observed him twice. I was impressed with the methods employed by the teachers in both teaching and correcting the children.

Sorry it's taken so long to return this questionnaire, but I wanted to observe the class before answering the questions.

I would like to visit the school but I've moved recently and it's been very hard for us.

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ DATE _____

CHILD'S NAME _____

PART I: Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
1. An effort was made to explain the program?	28	1		
2. You understood the goals of the program?	25	1	3	
3. This program was worthwhile?	28		1	
4. Your child benefitted from this program?	26		3	
5. The program was detrimental to your child?		29		
6. Generally speaking, your child was happy in this class situation?	29			
7. Your child liked school and was eager to attend?	29			
8. Your child felt secure both at home and at school?	29			
9. Your child was treated fairly?	29			
10. The school helped your child develop more self-confidence?	28		1	
11. Your child received a program that met his/her individual needs?	26		3	
12. Your child's teacher(s) was really interested in helping your child do well?	29			

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -

	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
13. Your child was encouraged to work to his/her potential?	21	2	6	
14. Your child progressed at his/her own best rate?	24		5	
15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she made?	28		1	
16. The school made an effort to communicate with parents?	29			
17. The staff encouraged parents to visit school?	28		1	
18. Your concerns were given proper attention?	27		2	
19. You were interested in helping the children at school?	23	2	4	

20. Did you visit the preschool and observe the program? YES 24 NO 5

55 Distributed
29 Returned = 53%

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

PART II: General Attitude Toward Integrated Preschool Classes

Directions: Check (✓) below all those statements which accurately reflect your personal reaction to the program.

FOR MY CHILD:

16 1. It was one of the most rewarding experiences he/she has ever had.

21 2. It was exactly what was needed.

13* 3. I hope he/she can continue next year.

22 4. It helped him/her personally.

14 5. It served its purpose.

13 6. It was fair.

1 7. It was neither very good nor very poor.

_____ 8. It was not exactly what was needed.

_____ 9. It did not hold his/her interest.

_____10. The experience did not provide any satisfaction.

_____11. It was very poorly planned.

_____12. It was a complete waste of time.

*The lower score on this item is attributed to the fact that these children will be going on to kindergarten next year and will not be continuing in the preschool.

Post Comments: Regular Preschool Parents

DO YOU FEEL THAT -

1. An effort was made to explain the program?

   A film was shown and the director explained the program before the school year began.

   Quite a few meetings were set up with the Board and the parents and fully explained at the beginning of school and throughout.

   Very clearly.

2. You understood the goals of the program?

   It was a great program.

   Needed some repetition of goals.

3. This program was worthwhile?

   I think it was beneficial to all the children.

   Very worthwhile for parents and children.

4. Your child benefitted from this program?

   He has made no comment.

   She was very solicitous of the boy with cerebral palsy.

   Very much so.

   Learned to help others.

   His experiences were broadened.

5. This program was detrimental to your child?

   Couldn't possibly be detrimental!

6. Your child was happy in this class situation?

   Very.

   Emily "mothered" Diana from the start.

7. Your child liked school and was eager to attend?

Very much so.

Every day!

Couldn't keep him away.

8. Your child felt secure both at home and at school?

Yes--especially at school--no insecurity.

11. Your child received a program that met his/her individual needs?

I am not clear on educational and social needs for Eileen.

13. Your child was encouraged to work to his/her potential?

This kind of pressure is out of place in a preschool!

As much as his potential is known at his age.

Again, I don't know what Eileen's potential is or what efforts would be necessary for her to realize it.

15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she made?

I am not sure he is that aware.

16. The school made an effort to communicate with parents?

A monthly newsletter and calendar of activities were sent home.

19. You were interested in helping the children at school?

Would have loved to have helped, but have two babies at home.

My helping rate isn't what it used to be.

Further Comments:

My son is at the age where an organized school like kindergarten is too much for him to grasp. Therefore, this Tiny Tots program was exactly what he enjoyed and woke up early for. He really loves his "school" and often tells others about it.

Emily felt a great accomplishment helping Diana with things she couldn't

Further Comments: (Continued)

do and really was proud of Diana when she learned a new task. I think this integration showed all the children they each need help learning tasks, some more than others.

This is a very, very rewarding program for both the children and parents The children have learned that all kids don't have complete use of all their facilities (like speech, motor, etc.) and they have learned how to adapt to each individual child, their needs - when they need help, etc. Having a semi-handicapped baby myself, my kids have learned to help and accept him so they accepted the other kids at school. The parents, I feel, have gotten over their fears of "how" to handle "handicapped" children and have learned that they aren't "fragile as eggs." I just can't say enough for or about this program, it is what all parties concerned needed. As for the children from T.C., they have progressed in all areas. They need a program like this at this early age, so they won't be "handicapped" all their life. Also, the word "handicapped" is useless in this situation, they're just kids who can't do one thing or another. I hope this program continues and I wish it was mandatory - it helps us all. Thanks for letting us have it!!!

SOLANO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HANDICAPPED CHILDREN--PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM
SPECIAL EDUCATION PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ DATE _____

CHILD'S NAME _____

PART I: Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
1. An effort was made to explain the program?	9		1	
2. You understood the goals of the program?	9		1	
3. This program was worthwhile?	10			
4. Your child benefitted from this program?	10			
5. The program was detrimental to your child?		10		
6. Generally speaking, your child was happy with this class situation?	9		1	
7. Your child liked school and was eager to attend?	10			
8. Your child felt secure both at home and at school?	10			
9. Your child was treated fairly?	10			
10. The school helped your child develop more self-confidence?	9		1	
11. Your child received a program that met his/her individual needs?	10			
12. Your child's teacher(s) was really interested in helping your child do well?	9		1	

SPECIAL EDUCATION PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
13. Your child was encouraged to work to his/her potential	9		1	
14. Your child progressed at his/her own best rate?	8		1	
15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she made?	7	1	2	
16. The school made an effort to communicate with parents?	7	2		
17. The staff encouraged parents to visit school?	8	1	2	
18. Your concerns were given proper attention?	10			
19. You were interested in helping the children at school?	5	4		
20. Your child is better able to express him/herself?	7	2	1	
21. Your child developed a better acceptance of his/her own handicap?	4	1	4	
22. You were provided with adequate reports from the school staff on the progress and problems of your child?	7	2	1	
23. You were provided with specific information from the school staff on how to help your child with his/her problem?	6	4		
24. The school provided you with materials to work with your child at home?	3	7		
25. Your child has benefitted enough from the program to continue next year? If tuition costs cannot be borne by the school district, would you be willing to contribute to the support of this program by paying their tuition?	4	4	2	

SPECIAL EDUCATION PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

Concerning the PRESCHOOL INTEGRATION PROGRAM,

DO YOU FEEL THAT -	YES	NO	NOT SURE	COMMENTS
26. Would you be willing or able to contribute any of your time to aid in this program, and if so, how much time?	3	6		

PART II: General Attitude Toward Integrated Preschool Classes

Directions: Check (✓) below all those statements which accurately reflect your personal reaction to the program.

FOR MY CHILD:

__4__ 1. It was one of the most rewarding experiences he/she has ever had.

__7__ 2. It was exactly what was needed.

__8__ 3. I hope he/she can continue next year.

__8__ 4. It helped him/her personally.

__3__ 5. It served its purpose.

__1__ 6. It was fair.

__-0-__ 7. It was neither very good nor very poor.

__1__ 8. It was not exactly what was needed.

__1__ 9. It did not hold his/her interest.

_____10. The experience did not provide any satisfaction.

_____11. It was very poorly planned.

_____12. It was a complete waste of time.

15 Distributed
10 Returned = 67%

Post Comments: Special Education Parents

DO YOU FEEL THAT -

6. Your child was happy with this class situation?

The teachers told me that he adjusted very well and liked it.

10. The school helped your child develop more self-confidence?

Hard to say, but I think it contributed to it.

12. Your child's teacher(s) was really interested in helping your child do well?

Definitely.

Very concerned about her interest.

13. Your child was encouraged to work to his/her potential?

With combined efforts of school and parent.

14. Your child progressed at his/her own best rate?

This is probably more up to the teacher to determine.

15. Your child is proud of the progress he/she made?

This showed at home by Mark's willingness to work on his own and to finish work.

19. You were interested in helping the children at school?

I have a small child at home.

I already volunteer at Irene Larsen.

20. Your child is better able to express him/herself?

At times he's trying very hard.

21. Your child developed a better acceptance of his/her own handicap?

I don't know if Troy realizes he is different.

Too early for Mark to determine.

DO YOU FEEL THAT -

25. Your child has benefited enough from the program to continue next year?

Definitely, because I consider this program of great importance.

As long as it wouldn't be a hardship on the rest of my children. I have a limited income.

We will not be here next year.

Depending on the cost.